

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated November 9, 2004. Claims 1 - 18 are pending in this application and have been rejected. Reexamination is respectfully requested in light of the following amendments.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has again rejected the claims as being anticipated by Jung '420 or obvious over Jung in view of Cannon '332. The Examiner has expressed the view that Applicant's claim 1 requires that the illumination optical system be for illuminating the digital micromirror device, and that based upon this language, '420 becomes an anticipation. On the other hand, Applicant previously urged the Examiner that the clause which states "luminous flux separating means for making light from the illumination optical system incident on the micromirror device" be the controlling clause.

Since the Examiner has relied upon the language "for illuminating the digital micromirror device with a luminous flux"

as supporting his position, this language has now been deleted from each of the independent claims. Applicant has reviewed the specification and respectfully submits that paragraph [0032] is fully consistent the claims as now amended.

In the independent claims as now amended, it is absolutely clear that the illumination optical system must have a polarized output (output from Applicant's converter (30)) and that this be incident on a polarization separating surface (51). On the other hand, '420 has no polarized light output from the lens (123) of the light source which comprises light (111) and the fly-eye lenses (121) and (122). Still further, Applicant claims each recite a luminous flux separating means. Applicant intentionally utilized the term "separating means". This is a means plus function terminology as permitted under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. This language is construed to mean the embodiments shown in the specification and reasonable equivalents. In Applicant's specification, the luminous flux separating means is the separating surface (51) of the polarization separating prism (50) which is directly illuminated by the S-polarized light from the polarization converter (30). There is no intervening polarization separating prism between the illumination and the luminous flux separating means as set forth in each of the independent claims. On the other hand, in '420, the light

incident on the dichoric beam splitter (140), while being polarized after having exited polarization beam splitter (130) does not allow reading of dichoric beam splitter (140) as a polarization beam splitter (130).

In the claims as now amended, as shown by Applicant's drawings, it is S-polarized light which is emitted from a polarization converter (30) which strikes a separating surface (51) thereby transmitting S-polarized light to quarter-wave plate (60) and then to DMD device (70). The quarter-wave plate (60) then further rotates light from the DMD device which returns to the separating means (51) in the form of P-polarized light. As P-polarized light, it can then pass directly through surface (51). This is not suggested by or taught by '420. The claim as now amended requiring uniform polarization direction light incident on the luminous flux separating means clearly defines over the '420 reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action in accordance therewith is requested. In the event there is any reason why the application cannot be allowed in this current condition, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact

S/N: 10/645,909

1/31/2005 Docket No.: KAW-304-USAP

the undersigned at the number listed below to resolve any problems by Interview or Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald R. Snider  
Reg. No. 24,962

Date: January 31, 2005

Snider & Associates  
Ronald R. Snider  
P.O. Box 27613  
Washington, D.C. 20038-7613  
(202) 347-2600

RRS/bam